

Joint measurements and Svetlichny's inequality

Yang Xiang^{1,*} and Wei Ren^{2,†}

¹*School of Physics and Electronics, Henan University, Kaifeng, Henan 475004, China*

²*Physics Department, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701, USA*

(Dated: December 30, 2010)

We prove that the Svetlichny's inequality can be derived from the existence of joint measurements and the principle of no-signaling. Then we show that, on the basis of quantum measurement assumption, it would imply the breach of causality if the magnitude of violation of Svetlichny's inequality exceeds quantum bound.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ta, 03.67.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

Heisenberg uncertainty [1] forbids in principle that non-commuting observables can be simultaneously measured with arbitrary accuracy. The extreme opposite of Heisenberg uncertainty is the Einstein's reality [2], and Bell's inequality [3] originally derived just from the assumption of the Einstein's reality and the no-signaling principle. However, quantum mechanics allows unsharp simultaneous measurements of two non-commuting observables [4–6]. This means that if we tolerate an increase in the variance of these two non-commuting observables we can perform a joint measurement of them. Here, joint measurement is defined so that one measurement on a single physical system simultaneously produces values for more than one observables. If these two observables mutually commute, it is obvious that the joint measurements of them can be accomplished with projective quantum measurements; if these two observables do not mutually commute, in order to carry out the joint measurement one has to adopt positive operator valued measures (POVMs) [7–9]. Essentially, the existence of joint measurements of some observables demands that a joint probability distribution of the values of these observables exists. Back in 1982, Fine [10] has pointed out that the existence of a joint probability distribution for the values of the observables which involved in a Bell's inequality must result in the satisfaction of the Bell's inequality. Along this line of thought, Andersson *et al.* [7, 8] replaced the Einstein's reality with the joint measurements and showed that from joint measurements and no-signaling principle Bell's inequality can also be derived. This indicates that the results of joint measurements result in the satisfaction of Bell's inequality. They also found that the Bell's inequality naturally provides a tight bound on the sharpness for the joint measurements, and this bound was first derived by Busch [11].

The purpose of this work is to introduce joint measurements into the study of genuine multipartite correlations

that cannot be reduced to mixtures of states in which a smaller number of subsystems are entangled, and to investigate the connection between them. The violation of Svetlichny's inequality (SI) [12] is a confirmation of genuine multipartite correlations, and the magnitude of violation of SI is usually regarded as a measure of it. We show that, if the no-signaling principle is available and joint measurements are made on one particle of a N -particle quantum system, then the N -particle SI can be derived. This means that the existence of joint measurements must produce the absence of genuine multipartite correlations. Finally, we give a discussion about the quantum bound on the violation of SI.

II. DERIVATION OF SVETLICHNY'S INEQUALITY

In this section, we only give the derivation of SI by assuming the existences of joint measurements and no-signaling principle, and present how to achieve joint measurements in the next section.

Derivation of three-particle SI Three-particle SI [12] can distinguish between genuine three-particle correlations and two-particle correlations. This means that one can find a violation of SI inequality if and only if there exist genuine three-particle correlations in a three-particle setting. Consider three observers, Alice, Bob, and Carol, who share three entangled qubits. Each of them can choose to measure one of two dichotomous observables. We denote A and A' as Alice's measurement results when she performs measurement a and a' respectively, and similarly B , B' , b , and b' (C , C' , c , and c') for Bob's (Carol's), and the measurement results of all observables can be -1 or $+1$. Then SI is expressed as [12]

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 \equiv & |E(ABC) + E(ABC') + E(AB'C) \\ & + E(A'BC) - E(AB'C') - E(A'BC') \\ & - E(A'B'C) - E(A'B'C')| \leq 4, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where S_3 is the three-particle Svetlichny's operator, and $E(ABC)$ represents the expectation value of the product of the measurement outcomes of the observables a , b , and c . It was shown by Svetlichny [12] that quantum

*Electronic address: njuxy@sohu.com

†Electronic address: weiren@uark.edu

predictions can violate his inequality, and the maximum violation ($S = 4\sqrt{2}$) allowed in quantum mechanics can be achieved with GHZ states [13].

Now we assume that Alice performs a joint measurement of a and a' , and denote the measurement results as A_J and A'_J . We can get

$$\begin{aligned}
& E(A_J BC) + E(A'_J BC) \\
&= P(A_J = A'_J = BC) + P(A_J = -A'_J = BC) \\
&\quad - P(A_J = A'_J = -BC) - P(A_J = -A'_J = -BC) \\
&\quad + P(A'_J = A_J = BC) + P(A'_J = -A_J = BC) \\
&\quad - P(A'_J = A_J = -BC) - P(A'_J = -A_J = -BC) \\
&= 2[P(A_J = A'_J = BC) - P(A'_J = A_J = -BC)] \\
&\leq 2[P(A_J = A'_J = BC) + P(A'_J = A_J = -BC)] \\
&= 2P(A_J = A'_J; bc), \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

where P is probability function, and $P(A_J = A'_J; bc)$ represents the probability of that Alice obtains $A_J = A'_J$ when Bob and Carol respectively choose performing measurement b and c .

Similarly, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
& E(A_J BC') - E(A'_J BC') \\
&= 2[P(A_J = -A'_J = BC') - P(-A'_J = A_J = -BC')] \\
&\leq 2[P(A_J = -A'_J = BC') + P(-A'_J = A_J = -BC')] \\
&= 2P(A_J = -A'_J; bc'), \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$E(A_J B'C) - E(A'_J B'C) \leq 2P(A_J = -A'_J; b'c), \tag{4}$$

and

$$E(A_J B'C') + E(A'_J B'C') \leq 2P(A_J = A'_J; b'c'). \tag{5}$$

From Eq. (1), Eq. (2), Eq. (3), Eq. (4), and Eq. (5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
S_3^J &\leq 2P(A_J = A'_J; bc) + 2P(A_J = A'_J; b'c') \\
&\quad + 2P(A_J = -A'_J; bc') + 2P(A_J = -A'_J; b'c), \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

where we denote S_3^J as the three-particle Svetlichny's operator concerned with joint measurements. Due to the no-signaling principle, the probability of Alice getting $A_J = A'_J$ or $A_J = -A'_J$ should be independent of the measurement choices of Bob and Carol, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
P(A_J = A'_J; bc) &= P(A_J = A'_J; b'c') = P(A_J = A'_J), \\
P(A_J = -A'_J; bc') &= P(A_J = -A'_J; b'c) \\
&= P(A_J = -A'_J) \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (6) and Eq. (7) we finally get $S_3^J \leq 4$, i.e. the three-particle SI.

Derivation of N -particle SI Suppose there are N players who share N particles, each one of them performs dichotomous measurements on each of the N particles. The measurement settings are represented by $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$, respectively, with possible values 0, 1. The measurement results are represented by $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N$, respectively, and with possible values $-1, 1$. Then the N -particle SI can be expressed as [14]

$$\begin{aligned}
S_N &\equiv \left| \sum_{\{x_i\}} v(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) E(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \right| \\
&\leq 2^{N-1}, \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

where S_N is the N -particle Svetlichny's operator, $\{x_i\}$ stands for an N -tuple $x_1, \dots, x_N$, $E(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ represents the expectation value of the product of the measurement outcomes of the observables $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$, and $v(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ is a sign function given by

$$v(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = (-1)^{\lfloor \frac{k(k-1)}{2} \rfloor}, \tag{9}$$

where k is the number of times index 1 appears in $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$.

Without losing generality, we assume the first player makes a joint measurement of $x_1 = 0$ and $x_1 = 1$ on the first particle, with results A_1^J and $A_1^{J'}$. We note that the summation in Eq. (8) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
S_N^J &= \left| \sum_{\{x_i\}'} \left[v(x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) E(A_1^J A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + v(x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N) E(A_1^{J'} A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \right] \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{\{x_i\}'} v(x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) \left[E(A_1^J A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) + (-1)^{k'} E(A_1^{J'} A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \right] \right|, \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

where k' denotes the number of times index 1 appears in $(x_2, \dots, x_N)$, S_N^J is the N -particle Svetlichny's operator concerned with joint measurements, and $\{x_i\}'$ stands for an $N-1$ -tuple $x_2, \dots, x_N$. There are 2^{N-1} terms in the summation $\sum_{\{x_i\}'}$. If the number of times index 1 appears in $(x_2, \dots, x_N)$ is even, i.e. k' is even, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& v(x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) [E(A_1^J A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) + (-1)^{k'} E(A_1^{J'} A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N)] \\
& \leq E(A_1^J A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) + E(A_1^{J'} A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \\
& = 2[P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'} = A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N) - P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'} = -A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N)] \\
& \leq 2[P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'} = A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N) + P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'} = -A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N)] \\
& = 2P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'} | x_2, \dots, x_N),
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'} | x_2, \dots, x_N)$ represents the probability of that the joint measurement results of the first player satisfy $A_1^J = A_1^{J'}$ when the measurement setting of other players is $x_2, \dots, x_N$. Similarly, if k' is odd we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& v(x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) [E(A_1^J A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) + (-1)^{k'} E(A_1^{J'} A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N)] \\
& \leq E(A_1^J A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) - E(A_1^{J'} A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N) \\
& = 2[P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'} = A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N) - P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'} = -A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N)] \\
& \leq 2[P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'} = A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N) + P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'} = -A_2 \cdots A_N | x_2, \dots, x_N)] \\
& = 2P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'} | x_2, \dots, x_N),
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Due to the no-signaling principle, the probability of the first player getting $A_1^J = A_1^{J'}$ or $A_1^J = -A_1^{J'}$ should be independent of the measurement choices of other players, i.e.

$$P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'} | x_2, \dots, x_N) = P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'}), \quad P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'} | x_2, \dots, x_N) = P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'}). \tag{13}$$

The number of terms with even k' in the summation $\sum_{\{x_i\}'}$ in Eq. (10) is $2^{N-2} ((\binom{N-1}{0}) + (\binom{N-1}{2}) + \dots = 2^{N-2})$, and there are also 2^{N-2} terms with odd k' in the summation $\sum_{\{x_i\}'}$. So from Eq. (10) we finally get the N -particle SI

$$\begin{aligned}
S_N^J & \equiv \left| \sum_{\{x_i\}'} v(x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) [E(A_1^J A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_N) + (-1)^{k'} E(A_1^{J'} A_2 \cdots A_N | x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_N)] \right| \\
& \leq \left| \left[\binom{N-1}{0} + \binom{N-1}{2} + \dots \right] \cdot 2P(A_1^J = A_1^{J'}) + \left[\binom{N-1}{1} + \binom{N-1}{3} + \dots \right] \cdot 2P(A_1^J = -A_1^{J'}) \right| \\
& = 2^{N-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

III. BOUND ON THE SHARPNESS OF JOINT MEASUREMENTS AND THE MAXIMAL VIOLATION OF SI

If a and a' both denote the usual projective quantum measurements, they can be described by projector collections of $\{E(\mathbf{a}), E(-\mathbf{a})\}$ and $\{E(\mathbf{a}'), E(-\mathbf{a}')\}$ respectively, where $E(\pm \mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{2}[I \pm \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}]$, $E(\pm \mathbf{a}') = \frac{1}{2}[I \pm \mathbf{a}' \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}]$, $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{a}'$ are the directions of the measurements a and a' , and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is Pauli operator. Suppose a and a' do not mutually commute we cannot perform a joint measurement of a and a' by doing a projective quantum measurement, since the observables a and a' do not share eigenstates. However quantum mechanics allows us to perform joint unsharp measurements of these two observables, and the unsharp measurements for these two observables can be described

as POVMs. We can describe the unsharp measurements of a and a' respectively as [7–9]

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\eta_1}(\pm \mathbf{a}) & = \frac{1}{2}[I \pm \eta_1 \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}], \\
E_{\eta_2}(\pm \mathbf{a}') & = \frac{1}{2}[I \pm \eta_2 \mathbf{a}' \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}],
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $0 < \eta_i \leq 1$ quantifies the sharpness of the joint measurements of a and a' . For a joint measurement of $\{E_{\eta_1}(\pm \mathbf{a})\}$ and $\{E_{\eta_2}(\pm \mathbf{a}')\}$, the only constraint on the $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{a}'$, η_1 , and η_2 is [7, 11]

$$|\eta_1 \mathbf{a} + \eta_2 \mathbf{a}'| + |\eta_1 \mathbf{a} - \eta_2 \mathbf{a}'| \leq 2. \tag{16}$$

If we take $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = \eta$, which means that the measurements of $\{E_{\eta_1}(\pm \mathbf{a})\}$ and $\{E_{\eta_2}(\pm \mathbf{a}')\}$ have equal sharpness, then the above condition can be expressed as

$$\eta[|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}'| + |\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}'|] \leq 2. \tag{17}$$

For the case of $\mathbf{a} \perp \mathbf{a}'$, $[|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{a}'| + |\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{a}'|]$ takes its maximal value of $2\sqrt{2}$, so from Eq. (17) we know that quantum mechanics allows joint unsharp measurements of any observables a and a' as long as the equal sharpness η is less than or equal to $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$.

According to quantum measurement theory, there is an essential property of unsharp measurement of $E_\eta(\pm\mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{2}[I \pm \eta\mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}]$. For any state ρ , the average value of the measurement results of $\{E_\eta(\pm\mathbf{a})\}$ is proportional to the expectation value of the corresponding sharp measurement, i.e.

$$\text{Tr}[\rho E_\eta(\mathbf{a})] - \text{Tr}[\rho E_\eta(-\mathbf{a})] = \eta \text{Tr}[\rho \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}]. \quad (18)$$

Now we assume the first player makes a joint unsharp measurement of a_1 and a'_1 on the first particle, with equal sharpness η . From Eq. (18) we can obtain $S_N^J = \eta S_N$. The condition of Eq. (17) means that, as long as the equal sharpness η satisfies $\eta \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ quantum mechanics allows the existence of joint unsharp measurements of any observables a and a' . The derivation in the previous section shows that the existence of joint measurements of two observables a_1 and a'_1 must demand that $S_N^J \leq 2^{N-1}$ or the no-signaling principle will be breached. So we can conclude that the quantum bound of S_N is necessarily not greater than $2^{N-1}\sqrt{2}$, and this bound can be achieved in quantum mechanics with the GHZ state of

$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\rangle_z^{\otimes N} \pm |\downarrow\rangle_z^{\otimes N})$ and a proper measurement protocol [14].

IV. CONCLUSION

The feasibility of joint measurements of some observables implies that there must be a joint probability distribution of the values of these observables, so we can derive SI from the existence of the joint measurements and the no-signaling principle. This means that, if we do not breach the no-signaling principle the results of joint measurements must produce the satisfaction of SI. Quantum mechanics allows joint unsharp measurement of any observables as long as the equal sharpness fulfills $\eta \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$, thus the quantum bound of S_N is necessarily not greater than $2^{N-1}\sqrt{2}$, otherwise we would get $S_N^J > 2^{N-1}$ and this implies the breach of the no-signaling principle.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by National Foundation of Natural Science in China under Grant Nos. 10947142 and 11005031.

-
- [1] W. Heisenberg, Z. Phys. **43**, 172(1927); J. A. Wheeler and W. Zurek, *Quantum Theory and Measurement* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983).
 - [2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777(1935).
 - [3] J. S. Bell, Physics (Long Island City, N.Y.) **1**, 195(1964); J. S. Bell, *Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1988).
 - [4] E. Arthurs and J. I. Kelly, Bell Syst. Tech. J. **44**, 725(1965).
 - [5] E. Arthurs and M. S. Goodman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2447(1988).
 - [6] S. Stenholm, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **218**, 233(1992).
 - [7] E. Andersson, S. M. Barnett, and A. Aspect, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042104(2005).
 - [8] W. Son, E. Andersson, S. M. Barnett, and M. S. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 052116(2005).
 - [9] P. Busch and C. R. Shilladay, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 034102(2003).
 - [10] A. Fine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 291(1982).
 - [11] P. Busch, Phys. Rev. D **33**, 2253(1986).
 - [12] G. Svetlichny, Phys. Rev. D **35**, 3066(1987).
 - [13] P. Mitchell, S. Popescu, and D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. A, **70**, 060101(2004).
 - [14] M. Seevinck and G. Svetlichny, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 060401(2002).